

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/666,521	09/20/2000	Jun Koyama	SEL 209	6933
7:	590 08/09/2006		EXAM	INER
Cook Alex M	cFarron Manzo Cumm	NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T		
Suite 2850 200 West Adam	ns Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Chicago, IL 60606			2629	_

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	— ————————————————————————————————————	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/666,521	KOYAMA, JUN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kimnhung Nguyen	2629
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some converse and provided by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. bly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on (03 July 2006	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for alle		rs, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und		•
Disposition of Claims	•	
4)☐ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	idiawii iioiii oonsideration.	
6) Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	nd/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar	niner	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		v the Examiner
Applicant may not request that any objection to	• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received in App	plication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have been re	eceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bu		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceived.
Attachment(s)		
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sui	
(PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE		Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/5/06</u> .	6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/666,521

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3 9-12, 18-22, 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) in view of Inoguchi et al. (US 6,262,531).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 19 and 28, Yamada et al. discloses in figs. 1, 5, an electronic device comprising an EL display device (11) including a thin film transistor (12); an EL element (11) with the pixel electrode as a cathode (11a, see col. 18, lines 66-67 and col. 19, lines 1-3); and an insulating layer (14) is formed on the driver transistor 12 and the selection transistor 13(see col. 7, lines 57-66), an applying means (see drain driver 4) for applying an analog image signal to the EL element; and a correcting means for gamma correcting (2c, fig. 5) the analog image signal.

However, Yamada et al. does not disclose an insulating layer for sealing the EL element.

Inoguchi et al. discloses a thin film EL display panel having the whole EL element is seal by silicon oil (or insulating layer, see col. 1, lines 46-49, col. 2, lines 36-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the whole EL element is seal by silicon oil as taught by Inoguchi et al. in to the electronic device of Yamada et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the silicon oil fills the gap between the EL element 90 and 91, and thus prevent moisture

Art Unit: 2629

after that and the oil adheres to the lead wire member 94 and it is difficult to clean it (see col. 2, lines 19-22).

Regarding claims 2, 10, 20, 29, Yamada et al. discloses further comprising a memory for storing data for the gamma-correcting (see table memory section 2d, and 2e, see col. 10, lines 43-46, and 66-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

Regarding claims 3, 12, 22 and 31, Yamada et al. discloses a color filter being formed at position corresponding to the pixel electrode (see col. 22, lines 15-23).

Regarding claims 11, 18, 21 and 30, Yamada et al. discloses the EL display device is used in an electronic device selected form the group consisting of an EL display.

3. Claims 5-7, 14-16, 24-26 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) and Inoguchi et al. (US 6,262,531) and in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,388,652).

Regarding claims 5-6,14-15, 24-25 and 33-34, Yamada et al. and Inoguchi et al. do not disclose the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red, or gamma-correcting attenuates a signal of blue or green. Yamazaki et al. discloses that wherein the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red and inherent of attenuates a signal of blue or green (see figure 14, column 18, lines 23-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the using the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red and inherent of attenuates a signal of blue or green as taught by Yamazaki et al. into the system of Yamada et al. and Inoguchi et al. because this would provide the analog signals have processed to complete, and these signals are transmitted to the source driving circuit of the system.

Page 4

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claims 7, 16, 26 and 35, Yamada et al. and Inoguchi et al. do not disclose the gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red. Yamazaki et al. discloses the gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red (see figure 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red as taught by Yamazaki et al. into the system of Yamada et al. and Inoguchi et al. because this would provide an improving the EL display having correction values for driving conditions of individual surface of the electron beam, by applying correction independently.

4. Claims 8, 17, 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) and Inoguchi et al. (US 6,262,531) as applied to claims 1,9,19 and 28, in view of Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,388,652 cited by Applicant), and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,445,005).

Yamada et al., Inoguchi et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) disclose every feature of the claimed invention as discussed above, however, they do not disclose the EL element comprises a luminescent layer comprising a polymer organic material. Yamazaki et al. (6,445,005) disclose an EL layer (45) is formed and made of polymer type organic material (see column 10, lines 37-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the an EL layer is formed and made of polymer type organic material as taught by Yamazaki et al. (6,445,005) into the device system of Yamada et al., Inoguchi et al. and Yamazaki et al. (6,388,652) because this would provide a light of white color to be a light emitting layer (see Yamazaki et al., 6445,005, see column 10, lines 62-63), and therefore, increasing the brightness of the display.

5. Claims 4, 13, 23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) and Inoguchi et al. (US 6,262,531), and as applied to claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 above, in view of Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,388,652), and further in view of Choi et al. (US patent 6,583,577).

Yamada et al., Inoguchi et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) disclose every feature of the claimed invention as discussed above, however, they do not disclose the El element comprises a first pixel comprising a blue luminescent layer, a second pixel comprising a green luminescent layer, and a third pixel comprising a red luminescent layer. Choi et al. disclose in figures 2 and 4 an El element comprises a first pixel (B) comprising a blue luminescent layer, a second pixel (G) comprising a green luminescent layer, and a third pixel (R) comprising a red luminescent layer (see first to third EL diodes, see figure 4, see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the first, second and third pixels comprising blue, green and red by EL diodes as taught by Choi et al. into the system of Yamada et al., Inoguchi et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) because this would be independently driven without a complicatedly-designed data driving circuit, thereby simplifying the data driving circuit as well as reducing the product cost.

Application/Control Number: 09/666,521 Page 6

Art Unit: 2629

Response To Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 filed on 7/3/06 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimnlung Monum
Kimnhung Nguyen

Patent Examiner

August 4, 2006